

Project Progress Report

Project Name: **Grants, Contracts, and Loans Management System**

Reporting Period:	From:	November 1, 2008	To:	November 30, 2008
-------------------	-------	------------------	-----	-------------------

Audience: Sadie Rodriquez-Hawkins, Jan Marie Ferrell, Polly Zehm, Lynne McGuire, DIS, and ISB

Schedule Status: ☐ **GREEN** ☐ **YELLOW** ☒ **RED**

(Green = project is on-time; Yellow = project is 10% behind schedule; Red = project is more than 10% behind schedule or a significant risk has arisen that could cause failure of the project)

Budget Status: ☒ **GREEN** ☐ **YELLOW** ☐ **RED**

(Green = project is on-budget; Yellow = project is 10% over budget; Red = project is more than 10% over budget or a significant risk has arisen that could cause failure of the project)

Risk Status: ☐ **GREEN** ☐ **YELLOW** ☒ **RED**

(Green = no new risks; Yellow = new risks are level 6 or less; Red = new risks are level 9)

Achievements

- Completed "Group 1" demonstration and analysis of Complex Documents and Clause and Text handling development
- Provided images and color schemes to Sierra to support Washington Look and Feel
- Conducted a review of the Survey requirements with the OGMA developer
- Project team member interviews conducted by Pacific Consulting Group
- Continued to make good progress on the issues, changes, and to-do lists.
- Completed the development and unit testing of all service bus interfaces (Financial Transactions, Financial Transaction Validation, Vendor, Performance Measures, Titles, Agreement Data, Enterprise Reporting, and MWBE Certification data)
- For GIS; completed:
 - Hardware specifications
 - Licensing model
 - Set up and configure servers
 - Creation of a GIS Administration Group

Objectives for the next reporting period

- Group 2 Demonstration (Multi-level Budget Support, Multiple Roles, Workflow Changes, Active Directory, Washington Look and Feel)
- For GIS:
 - Install and configure ESRI software 9.3
 - Develop operations, promotion model, patch control process, and installation/configuration process documentation

- For Service Bus:
 - Error handling on all interfaces
 - Walkthrough QA installation, configuration, and promotion process
 - Promote services from development to QA
 - System testing of all interfaces
 - Transition and knowledge transfer

Schedule

Major Milestones and Deliverables for November

Group 1 demonstration (Complex Documents and Clause and Text Handling)

Planned Major Milestones and Deliverables	<u>Original</u>	<u>Revised</u>
▪ Pilot		<u>2009</u>
○ Configure System	11/08	1 st Qtr.
○ System Testing	11/08	2 nd Qtr.
○ Performance Testing		1 st Qtr.
○ User Acceptance Testing	12/08	2 nd Qtr.
○ Re-baseline – Go/No-Go	12/08	2 nd Qtr.
○ Pilot deployment		2 nd Qtr.
▪ ECY – CTED first program implementation	1/09	2 nd Qtr.
▪ Rollout to remaining programs (2 nd Rollout)	6/09	4 th Qtr.
○ ECY – CTED program workshops		3 rd Qtr.
○ Updated design/configuration specifications		3 rd Qtr.
○ Configure/Test System		4 th Qtr.
○ User Acceptance Testing & Training		4 th Qtr.
○ Deploy system		4 th Qtr.
▪ Post implementation review	7/09	4 th Qtr.

Budget

IT Project Pool:	5,463,810
<i>Project-to-date (7/07 to 10/08)</i>	
<i>* Expense transactions recorded as of December 08</i>	
Salaries/Benefits	669,146
Internal Administrative	251,052
Software Package	690,000
External QA	68,470
External Testing	98,388
Equipment	91,388
Travel	1,938
Goods & Services:	5,233
Total Expense:	1,875,615

Project Balance:	3,588,195
-------------------------	------------------

Issues

20268: Delay in response from AFRS for financial transaction validation.

AFRS for financial transaction validation response is taking too long. This is an issue if GCLM is going expect the fiscal office staff to wait for the response.

GCLM/Service Bus will need to make design consideration to use an asynchronous connection effectively.

Risks

Newly discovered or re-arisen, including Risk Severity Indicator

20494: Product demonstrations will take a considerable amount of time.

Risk: The team is concerned with the amount of time it takes to view the demonstration and analyze the results. The first demonstration involved 38 requirements. It took the team 3.5 hours for the demonstration and another 5 hours to review and analyze. Future demonstrations will include more requirements (e.g. Group 2 includes about 70 requirements) that potentially could double the amount of time for demonstration and analysis.

Mitigation: Change the method used to assess the demonstrations. Using the requirements and ambiguities associated with the functional group being demonstrated as a foundation; provide to Sierra scenarios the team would want to see demonstrated (*how one would perform something and what are the results*). As the team views the demonstration, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and risks for each scenario will be documented.

Following the demonstration, the results will be discussed amongst the team and a summary provided to the Executive Steering Committee. If there were any areas of concern, this information would be provided to Sierra for remediation for the final demonstration.